



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/083,601	05/22/1998	CHRISTOPH E. SCHEURICH	INTL0045USP5	4253

7590 05/09/2006

TIMOTHY N. TROP, REG. NO 28994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 KATY FREEWAY, STE 100
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER

AN, SHAWN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2621

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/083,601	Applicant(s) SCHEURICH ET AL.	
	Examiner Shawn S. An	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks

1. Applicant's remarks as filed on 4/24/06 have been carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As per Applicant's arguments regarding dependent claims 40 and 44 please refer to the following grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 39-41, 43, 45-47, 49, 51-53, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thro et al (6,037,991) in view of Gerber et al (6,163,793).

Regarding claims 39, 45, and 51, Thro et al discloses a method, computer storage medium (program instructions), and a computer system comprising:

a processor to execute a program for:

receiving in the program executed by the computer (Fig. 2, 205) a first request generated by an application program executed by the computer for a frame rate and a second request generated by the application program for a resolution (abs.), the first request and the second request associated with communication between a camera (Fig. 1, 116) and the computer (205); and

using the program to:

evaluate a bandwidth available for the communication between the camera and the computer (col. 4, lines 3-23), and

comply with the first request (priority, frame rate) and based on the evaluation of the available bandwidth, selectively not comply with the second request (secondary priority, resolution) (col. 4, lines 3-36).

Thro et al discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations with the exception of a driver program.

However, even though Thro's program does not specifically include the driver program, it is conventionally well known for programs associated with such as Windows XP and/or CD games inherently possess or need complementary driver program for the program to work successively. In other words, many programs associated with a computer can't execute operations without the aid of the proper/corresponding driver program.

Furthermore, Applicant's admitted prior art (Fig. 1) teaches the application program (16) may submit specific requests to regulate the manner in which the stream of data is communicated between the camera (12) and the computer (14), and typically, a driver program (13) causes the computer (14) to interact with the camera (12) in an attempt to satisfy these requests (Applicant: page 1, 2nd para.).

Moreover, Gerber et al teaches that computer systems can contain a host processor and an aux processor, which is used to control the operation of the aux processor programs, and to process data on the aux processor the application program interfaces with the driver program, and in turn, the driver program interfaces with the auxiliary processor programs to provide for their execution (col. 1, lines 17-28).

Therefore, it would have been considered quite obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing a computer system as taught by Thro et al to incorporate all of the known conventional concepts as taught by Applicant's admitted prior art and Gerber et al so that a driver program evaluates a bandwidth available for the communication between the camera and the computer and comply with the first request and based on the evaluation of the available bandwidth, selectively not comply with the second request, since many programs associated with a computer can't execute operations without the aid of the proper/corresponding driver program.

Regarding claims 41, 47, and 53, Thro et al discloses submitting communication requests to a bus interface of the computer (205, also inherency emphasized), each request being associated with different bandwidth (inherently, depends on the (amount) data transfer rate) (Fig. 3, 305), and based on the response of the bus interface to the communication requests, determining available bandwidth (col. 4, lines 3-23).

Regarding claims 43, 49, and 55, Thro et al discloses, wherein non-compliance with the second request (resolution) comprises adjusting the resolution (higher the transmission frame rate, the lower the resolution) different than the second request (Fig. 4, 409; col. 11, lines 6-15).

Regarding claims 40, 46, and 52, Thro et al does not specifically disclose intermittently checking the available bandwidth and determining whether to comply with the second request (resolution) to accommodate changes in the bandwidth.

However, Thro et al teaches receiving video information intermittently from each selected video device, (col. 10, lines 47-49), and checking the available bandwidth and determining whether to comply with the second request (resolution) to accommodate changes in the bandwidth (col. 4, lines 3-41). Note: the higher the transmission frame rate, the lower the resolution.

Since Thro et al's program have been discussed with respect to complying with the first request (priority, frame rate) and based on the evaluation of the available bandwidth, selectively not complying with the second request (secondary priority, resolution) and Thro et al teaches receiving video information intermittently, and checking the available bandwidth and determining whether to comply with the second request (resolution) to accommodate changes in the bandwidth, and also incorporating the conventionally well known driver program as discussed above, it would have been considered obvious for the driver program to intermittently check the available bandwidth and determine whether to comply with the second request (resolution) to accommodate changes in the bandwidth to ensure that all of the transmitted video data does not exceed the maximum capacity of the bandwidth of the communication resource.

4. Claims 42, 48, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thro et al and Gerber et al as applied to claims 39, 45, and 51 above, respectively, and further in view of Garofalakis et al (6,330,609 B1).

Regarding claims 42, 48, and 54, Thro et al discloses progressively using the bus (interface) requests to request more bandwidth (205, inherency emphasized, depends on the (amount) data transfer rate), and submitting the communication requests (Fig. 3, 305; col. 4, lines 3-23).

Thro et al does not specifically disclose submitting the communication requests for larger bandwidths until the bus interface denies one of the communication requests.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in a communication system (software) to deny the communication requests based on the bandwidth constraints (e.g. system (program) message).

Furthermore, Garofalakis et al teaches admission control system including submitting the communication requests (Fig. 1, 36) for bandwidths until the server (comprises bus interface) (Fig. 1, 10) denies one of the communication requests (col. 2, lines 7-23).

Therefore, it would have been considered quite obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing a computer system as taught by Thro et al to incorporate Garofalakis et al's concepts as discussed above so as to submit the communication requests for larger bandwidths until the bus interface denies one of the communication requests, because there is no need to keep requesting larger bandwidths when an available bandwidth does not exist.

5. Claims 44, 50, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thro et al and Gerber et al as applied to claims 39, 45, and 51 above, respectively, and further in view of Masamine et al (JP; 10-070641).

Regarding claims 44, 50, and 56, Thro et al does not specifically disclose adjusting the resolution based at least in part on a determination of a scaling capability of the camera.

However, Masamine et al teaches an image transmission system comprising sending an image with a resolution and a transmission speed in matching (adjusting the resolution) with a display capability of an image receiver (a display monitor) (abs).

In other words, Masamine et al teaches adjusting the resolution based at least in part on a determination of a scaling capability of the display monitor.

Masamine et al teaches determining scaling capability of the display monitor, whereas Applicant's claimed feature determines scaling capability of the camera.

However, one of skill in the art would readily recognize that scaling capability of the display monitor and the scaling capability of the camera are substantially very similar.

Therefore, it would have been considered quite obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing a computer system as taught by Thro et al to incorporate Masamine et al's concepts as discussed above so as to adjust the resolution based at least in part on a determination of the scaling capability of the camera so as to ensure all of the transmitted video data meets the client's expectations, and does not exceed the maximum capacity of the bandwidth of the communication resource.

Conclusion

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to *Shawn S. An* whose telephone number is 571-272-7324.

Art Unit: 2621

8. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



SHAWN AN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/07/06